

Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated November 3, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. In the present application, claims 1, 6-10, 20-21, 26 and 30 have been amended. No new matter was added. Claims 2-5 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Interview Summary

A telephonic interview between the undersigned representative for the Applicants and the Examiner was held on January 21, 2009. During the interview proposed amendments were discussed to address the 112 and 102 rejections. No agreement was reached as to allowability.

Objections to the Disclosure

The disclosure is objected to because of alleged informalities in paragraph [0035]. The objected to language has been removed. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

112 (first paragraph)

Claim 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim language of concern, such as “being compatible with the first operating system and incompatible with the second operating system,” has been removed from the claims. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 112 rejection.

102 Rejections

Claims 1-10, 12 and 20-30 are rejected as being anticipated by Salmenkaita (U.S. Patent App. 2004/0176958). Applicants respectfully traverses the rejections to the extent that they apply to the currently pending claims.

Claims 1, 6-10 and 12

Applicant respectfully submits that Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature recited by claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites, “receiving a user input by a first operating system of the first computer via a first computer input peripheral device,” and “executing the user input instruction on the second computer that instructs the second operating system to execute an instruction equivalent to receiving the user input at an input peripheral device of the second computer.” Thus, claim 1 recites receiving a user input on a first computer via an input peripheral device and executing a user input instruction on a second computer that instructs the operating system of the second computer to execute an instruction equivalent to receiving the user input at an input peripheral device of the second computer.

The Office Action contends that Salmenkaita describes executing a second user input instruction on the second computer. Salmenkaita describes a method and system for facilitating user access to services through a wireless device of a user. Salmenkaita further describes the use of voice shortcuts with the shortcuts tagged for a particular service in an XML format. The receipt of a voice command by the wireless device can trigger the transmission of XML code to a network server to request a listing of services and cause the server to provide the requested listing of services via XML. However, these features described by Salmenkaita fail to describe executing a user input instruction on a second computer that instructs the operating system of the second computer to execute an instruction equivalent to receiving the user input at an input peripheral device of the second computer where the user input was received on a first computer. Salmenkaita is silent on executing an instruction on a second computer that is equivalent to receiving a user input at an input peripheral device of the second computer. Thus, Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature of claim 1 such that claim 1 is allowable over Salmenkaita. Claims 1, 6-10 and 12 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 1 recites an additional feature not described by Salmenkaita. For example, claim 1 recites, “wherein the second operating system translates the XML item into the user input instruction according to a database that comprises XML items associated to corresponding instructions of the second operating system.” Salmenkaita fails to describe translating an XML item into a user input instruction according to a database that comprises XML items associated to corresponding instructions of an operating system. Thus, Salmenkaita fails to describe each and

every feature of claim 1 such that claim 1 is allowable for this additional and independent reason. Claims 1, 6-10 and 12 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for this additional and independent reason.

Claim 20

Applicant respectfully submits that Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature recited by claim 20. For example, claim 20 recites, “translates the user input instructions into a first non-proprietary data script defining an outgoing software object such that the outgoing software object provides instructions to the second computer to execute instructions corresponding to the user input received via a first user interface of the first computer.” Thus, claim 20 recites translating user input instructions into a software object such that the object provides instructions to a second computer to execute instructions corresponding to the user input received via a user interface of a first computer.

The Office Action contends that Salmenkaita describes executing a second user input instruction on a second computer. Salmenkaita describes a method and system for facilitating user access to services through a wireless device of a user. Salmenkaita further describes the use of voice shortcuts with the shortcuts tagged for a particular service in an XML format. The receipt of a voice command by the wireless device can trigger the transmission of XML code to a network server to request a listing of services and cause the server to provide the requested listing of services via XML. However, these features described by Salmenkaita fail to describe a software object that provides instructions to a second computer corresponding to user input received via a user interface of a first computer. Thus, Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature of claim 20 such that claim 20 is allowable over Salmenkaita.

Claim 20 recites an additional feature not described by Salmenkaita. For example, claim 20 recites, “translates the user input instructions into a first non-proprietary data script defining an outgoing software object ... the translation being accomplished by referencing a database to match the user input instructions in the first computer language to contents of the first non-proprietary script.” Salmenkaita fails to describe translating user input instructions into a non-proprietary data script by referencing a database to match the input instructions to non-proprietary script content. Thus, Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature of claim 20 such that claim 20 is allowable for this additional and independent reason.

Claims 21-25

Applicant respectfully submits that Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature recited by claim 21. For example, claim 21 recites, “creating data defining a first XML item corresponding to the outgoing instructions such that the XML item provides instructions to the second computer to execute instructions corresponding to the output generated on the first computer.” Thus, claim 21 recites an XML item that provides instructions to the second computer to execute instructions corresponding to the output generated on the first computer.

The Office Action contends that Salmenkaita describes executing a second user input instruction on a second computer. Salmenkaita describes a method and system for facilitating user access to services through a wireless device of a user. Salmenkaita further describes the use of voice shortcuts with the shortcuts tagged for a particular service in an XML format. The receipt of a voice command by the wireless device can trigger the transmission of XML code to a network server to request a listing of services and cause the server to provide the requested listing of services via XML. However, these features described by Salmenkaita fail to describe an XML item that provides instructions to a second computer to execute instructions corresponding to output generated on a first computer. Thus, Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature of claim 21 such that claim 21 is allowable over Salmenkaita. Claims 22-25 depend from claim 21 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21

Claim 21 recites an additional feature not described by Salmenkaita. For example, claim 21 recites, “wherein the outgoing instructions are translated into the first XML item at the first computer by referencing a database that comprises XML elements associated to corresponding instructions of the first computer language.” Salmenkaita fails to describe translating outgoing instructions by referencing a database that comprises XML elements associated to corresponding instructions. Thus, Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature of claim 21 such that claim 21 is allowable for this additional and independent reason. Claims 22-25 depend from claim 21 and are allowable for this additional and independent reason.

Claims 26-30

Applicant respectfully submits that Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature recited by claim 26. For example, claim 26 recites, “executing the second user input instruction by the second computer, wherein the second user input instruction corresponds to the first user input received via the first user interface of the first computer.” Thus, claim 26 recites executing a second user input instruction on a second computer that corresponds to a first user input instruction received via a first user interface of the first computer.

The Office Action contends that Salmenkaita describes executing a second user input instruction on the second computer. Salmenkaita describes a method and system for facilitating user access to services through a wireless device of a user. Salmenkaita further describes the use of voice shortcuts with the shortcuts tagged for a particular service in an XML format. The receipt of a voice command by the wireless device can trigger the transmission of XML code to a network server to request a listing of services and cause the server to provide the requested listing of services via XML. However, these features described by Salmenkaita fail to describe executing a second user input on a second computer that corresponds to a first user input received via a first user interface of the first computer. Thus, Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature of claim 26 such that claim 26 is allowable over Salmenkaita. Claims 27-30 depend from claim 26 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 26.

Claim 26 recites an additional feature not described by Salmenkaita. For example, claim 26 recites, “wherein the data defining the first software object is created by referencing a first database comprising software objects in non-proprietary formats associated with user input instructions.” Salmenkaita fails to describe creating a software object by referencing a database comprising software objects in non-proprietary formats associated with user input instructions. Thus, Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature of claim 26 such that claim 26 is allowable for this additional and independent reason. Claims 27-30 depend from claim 26 and are allowable for this additional and independent reason.

Conclusion

Applicant asserts that the application including claims 1, 6-10, 12 and 20-30 are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 31, 2009

/Daniel J. Layden/
Daniel J. Layden
Reg. No. 60,921

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(770) 643-8912